



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,817	08/31/2001	Gene Golovchinsky	FXPL-01001US0	2360

23910 7590 08/03/2005

FLIESLER MEYER, LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/944,817

Applicant(s)

GOLOVCHINSKY ET AL.

Examiner

Laurie Ries

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment, filed 11 February 2005, to the original application, filed 31 August 2001.
2. Claims 1-50 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being direct to non-statutory subject matter.
3. Claims 1-56 are pending. Claims 1, 39, and 56 are independent claims.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments, see amendment, filed 11 February 2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-56 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 1-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claim 1: The language of these claims merely describes a computer program per se. As such, this raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine, which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 USC 101.

One technique for satisfying the requirements of 35 USC 101 is to claim code residing in memory (i.e., hardware), wherein that code produces a tangible result.

Regarding claim 39: The language of this claim merely describes non-functional descriptive material. As such, this raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine, which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 USC 101.

One technique for satisfying the requirements of 35 USC 101 is to claim code residing in memory (i.e., hardware), wherein that code produces a tangible result.

Claims 2-38 and 40-50 are dependent upon claims 1 and 39, and do not add any limitations that would render the claims statutory under 35 USC 101. Therefore, these claims are likewise rejected.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-9, 14-15, 24, 26, 38-40, 42-43, 51, and 53-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1).

As per claims 1, 5, 39, and 51, Carro discloses a system and method for detecting an annotated anchor in a document including locating an annotation in the document (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0059) and detecting, close to or within the annotation, an anchor (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0059). Carro also discloses processing the annotated anchor (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055). Carro also discloses that the method can be performed on a number of documents (See Carro, Abstract).

As per claim 2, Carro discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Carro also discloses an anchor that represents an explicit link to at least one other location (See Carro, Page 1, paragraphs 0001 and 0009).

As per claim 3, Carro discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Carro also discloses an anchor that represents an implicit link to at least one other location (See Carro, Page 1, paragraph 0009).

As per claim 4, Carro discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Carro also discloses a data structure, in the form of a hyperlink table, referencing the annotated anchor (See Carro, page 4, paragraph 0055).

As per claims 6 and 40, Carro discloses the limitations of claims 5 and 39 as described above. Carro also discloses generating a data structure, in the form of a hyperlink table, including the annotated anchor (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055).

As per claim 7, Carro discloses the limitations of claim 6 as described above. Carro also discloses that the data structure includes a number of annotated anchors (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055).

As per claim 8, Carro discloses the limitations of claim 7 as described above. Carro also discloses that the number of annotated anchors are obtained from at least one document (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0059).

As per claim 9, Carro discloses the limitations of claim 7 as described above. Carro also discloses that the format includes displaying the annotated anchors in the data structure in a format (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055).

As per claim 14, Carro discloses the limitations of claim 9 as described above. Carro also discloses that the annotated anchors of each represent a link to at least one target (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055), and that the format includes displaying the annotated anchors according to the target data (See Carro, Figure 11, and Page 7, paragraph 0108).

As per claim 15, Carro discloses the limitations of claim 14 as described above. Carro also discloses that the target is a second document (See Carro, Page 6, paragraph 0080).

As per claim 24, Carro discloses the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Carro also discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least a first target (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055), including locating a second document that includes a reference to the first target (See Carro, Page 6, paragraph 0082).

As per claim 26, Carro discloses the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Carro also discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least a second document, where the processing code includes obtaining the second document (See Carro, Page 6, paragraphs 0082-0084).

As per claim 38, Carro discloses the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Carro also discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055), where the processing code includes displaying the annotated anchor and the target (See Carro, Figure 11, and Page 7, paragraph 0108).

As per claim 42, Carro discloses the limitations of claim 39 as described above. Carro also discloses that the annotated anchors each represent a link to at least one target (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055).

As per claim 43, Carro discloses the limitations of claim 39 as described above. Carro also discloses that at least one of the annotated anchors represent a link to a

second document, and including determining whether the second document is stored in the system (See Carro, Page 6, paragraph 0080).

As per claim 53, Carro discloses the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Carro also discloses that the target is a second document (See Carro, Page 6, paragraph 0080).

As per claim 54, Carro discloses the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Carro also discloses that at least one of the annotated anchors represent a link to a second document, and including determining whether the second document is stored in the system (See Carro, Page 6, paragraph 0080).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 10, 16-20, 41, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) as applied to claims 7 39, and 51 above, and further in view of Wright (U.S. Publication 2002/0091679 A1).

As per claims 10, 41, and 52, Carro discloses the limitations of claims 9, 39, and 51 as described above. Carro does not disclose expressly displaying the annotated anchors according to annotation metadata. Wright discloses displaying

anchors according to metadata or attributes, such as color, size or shape. (See Wright, Abstract, and Page 1, paragraph 10). Carro and Wright are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a user in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the formatted display of Wright with the system and method of Carro. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to effectively and quickly pick out information or items of interest (See Wright, Page 1, paragraph 0006). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wright with Carro for the benefit of allowing a user to effectively and quickly pick out information or items of interest to obtain the invention as specified in claims 10, 41, and 52.

As per claims 16 and 17, Carro discloses the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Carro does not disclose expressly adding the annotated anchor to a data structure based on at least one attribute value. Wright discloses code which includes adding anchors or hyperlinks to a data structure based on at least one attribute, and that the data structure has a number of hyperlinks that have at least one attribute value. (See Wright, Abstract). Carro and Wright are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the data organization by attribute of Wright with the system and method of Carro. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to effectively and quickly pick out information or items of interest (See Wright, Page 1, paragraph 0006). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wright with

Carro for the benefit of allowing a user to effectively and quickly pick out information or items of interest to obtain the invention as specified in claims 16 and 17.

As per claim 18, Carro and Wright disclose the limitations of claim 17 as described above. Carro also discloses that the number of annotated anchors, or hyperlinks, are obtained from a number of documents. (See Carro, Abstract).

As per claims 19 and 20, Carro and Wright disclose the limitations of claim 17 as described above. Carro also discloses that the number of annotated anchors, or hyperlinks, are displayed in a format (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055). Wright also discloses that the format includes displaying the annotated anchors or hyperlinks according to the annotation metadata or attributes. (See Wright, Abstract, and Page 1, paragraph 0010). Carro and Wright are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the data organization by attribute of Wright with the system and method of Carro. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to effectively and quickly pick out information or items of interest (See Wright, Page 1, paragraph 0006). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wright with Carro for the benefit of allowing a user to effectively and quickly pick out information or items of interest to obtain the invention as specified in claims 19 and 20.

8. Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Sundaresan (U.S. Patent 6,641,058 B1).

As per claim 11, Carro discloses the limitations of claim 9 as described above. Carro does not disclose expressly that the format includes displaying the annotated anchors according to the annotated anchor metadata. Sundaresan discloses associating hyperlinks according to their metadata. (See Sundaresan, Column 8, lines 63-67, and Column 9, lines 1-8). Once hyperlinks are associated by their metadata, it would be inherently obvious to display the hyperlinks using this associated format. Carro and Sundaresan are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the metadata association of Sundaresan with the system and method of Carro. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the user with access to information which is related by relevance to a particular topic or set of attributes as is contained within a document's metadata and to reduce the number of reoccurring documents. (See Sundaresan, Column 3, lines 37-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sundaresan with Carro for the benefit of improved data organization to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

As per claim 12, Carro and Sundaresan disclose the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Carro also discloses that the annotated anchors each represent a link to at least one target (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055), where the annotated anchor

metadata includes a number of anchors within the document representing the target (See Carro, Figure 5, and Page 6, paragraph 0075).

As per claim 13, Carro and Sundaresan disclose the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Carro also discloses that the annotated anchors each represent a link to at least one target (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055), where the annotated anchor metadata includes a number of annotated anchors representing the target (See Carro, Figure 5, and Page 6, paragraph 0075).

9. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) in view of Wright (U.S. Publication 2002/0091679 A1) as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Sundaresan (U.S. Patent 6,641,058 B1).

As per claim 21, Carro and Wright disclose the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Carro and Wright do not disclose expressly that the format includes displaying the annotated anchors according to annotated anchor metadata. Sundaresan discloses associating hyperlinks according to their metadata. (See Sundaresan, Column 8, lines 63-67, and Column 9, lines 1-8). Once hyperlinks are associated by their metadata, it would be inherently obvious to display the hyperlinks using this associated format. Carro, Wright and Sundaresan are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious

to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the metadata association of Sundaresan with the system and method of Carro and Wright. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the user with access to information which is related by relevance to a particular topic or set of attributes as is contained within a document's metadata and to reduce the number of reoccurring documents. (See Sundaresan, Column 3, lines 37-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sundaresan with Carro and Wright for the benefit of improved data organization to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

10. Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) in view of Wright (U.S. Publication 2002/0091679 A1) as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1).

As per claim 22, Carro and Wright disclose the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Carro and Wright do not disclose expressly displaying the annotated anchors, or hyperlinks, according to target metadata. Ingram also discloses that the annotated anchors of Carro and Wright as described above each represent a link to at least one target and where the format includes displaying the annotated anchors according to the target metadata. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraphs 0039-0040). Carro, Wright and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a user in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art to include the displaying of annotated anchors according to target metadata of Ingram with the system and method of Carro and Wright. The motivation for doing so would have been to enable users to activate the hyperlink at any time (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Carro and Wright for the benefit of enabling users to activate the hyperlink at any time to obtain the invention as specified in claim 22.

As per claim 23, Carro, Wright and Ingram disclose the limitations of claim 22 as described above. Carro also discloses that the target is a second document (See Carro, page 6, paragraph 0080).

11. Claims 25, 27, 31, 33, 36-37, 45, and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) as applied to claims 5, 24, 26, and 39 above, and further in view of Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1).

As per claims 25 and 33, Carro discloses the limitations of claims 24 and 31 as described above. Carro also discloses that the document contains a second annotated anchor representing a link to at least a second target (See Carro, Page 6, paragraph 0082). Carro does not disclose expressly locating at least a second document that includes a reference to the first and second targets in the second document. Ingram discloses including a reference to the first and second targets in subsequent documents (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0041). Ingram discloses that the hyperlink, or anchor, is within a second document (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040). Carro and Ingram

are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the reference to the first and second targets within subsequent documents of Ingram with the system and method of Carro. The motivation for doing so would have been to enable the user to return to the page of origination (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0041). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Carro for the benefit of enabling the user to return to the page of origination to obtain the invention as specified in claims 25 and 33.

As per claim 27, Carro discloses the limitations of claim 26 as described above. Carro does not disclose expressly obtaining the second document prior to a reader requesting the second document. Ingram discloses obtaining documents prior to a user's request for the documents and enabling access to the documents by adding items representing the documents to a taskbar (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040). Carro and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obtaining documents prior to a user's request for the documents of Ingram with the system and method of Carro. The motivation for doing so would have been to enable users to view the page referenced by the hyperlink at any given time (See Ingram, Pages 2-3, paragraph 0040). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

combine Ingram with Carro for the benefit of enabling users to view the page referenced by the hyperlink at any given time to obtain the invention as specified in claim 27.

As per claims 31 and 45, Carro discloses the limitations of claims 5 and 39 as described above. Carro also discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055). Carro does not disclose expressly suppressing a display of the second anchor. Ingram discloses suppressing a display of a second anchor by taking a snapshot of the anchor, or hyperlink, and including the anchor or hyperlink reference on a taskbar (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Carro and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the suppression of the display of the second anchor of Ingram with the system and method of Carro. The motivation for doing so would have been to take full advantage of the viewable area on the display (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Carro for the benefit of taking full advantage of the viewable area on the display to obtain the invention as specified in claims 31 and 45.

As per claims 36 and 48, Carro discloses the limitations of claims 5 and 39 as described above. Carro does not disclose expressly identifying a node representing the target and suppressing a display of the node. Ingram discloses identifying, in the hypertext structure, a node representing the target and suppressing a display of the node, allowing the reader to see only an item listed in the taskbar. (See Ingram, Page

Art Unit: 2176

2, paragraph 0040). Carro and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the suppression of the display of a node of Ingram with the system and method of Carro. The motivation for doing so would have been to take full advantage of the viewable area on the display (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Carro for the benefit of taking full advantage of the viewable area on the display to obtain the invention as specified in claims 36 and 48.

As per claims 37 and 49, Carro and Ingram disclose the limitations of claims 36 and 48 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the code includes identifying, in the hypertext structure, an object representing the link and suppressing a display of the object. (See Ingram, Page 4, paragraph 0054). Carro and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the suppression of the display of an object of Ingram with the system and method of Carro. The motivation for doing so would have been to take full advantage of the viewable area on the display (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Carro for the benefit of taking full advantage of the viewable area on the display to obtain the invention as specified in claims 37 and 49.

As per claim 50, Carro discloses the limitations of claim 39 as described above. Carro does not disclose expressly displaying simultaneously the annotated anchor and the target. Ingram discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target, and that the code includes displaying the annotated anchor and the target. (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0047). Carro and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the simultaneous display of the anchor and the target of Ingram with the system and method of Carro. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide for the user an easy one click method for returning to the page of origin (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0050). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Carro for the benefit of providing the user with an easy one click method for returning the page of origin to obtain the invention as specified in claim 50.

12. Claims 28, 30, 44, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) as applied to claims 5, 39, and 51 above, and further in view of Bays (U.S. Publication 2003/0018632 A1).

As per claims 28, 44, and 55, Carro discloses the limitations of claims 5, 39 and 51 as described above. Carro also discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target and that the code includes detecting a second anchor representing a link to the target. (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055). Carro does not

Art Unit: 2176

disclose expressly propagating the annotation to the second anchor. Bays discloses that annotations may be written to other data items. (See Bays, Page 6, paragraph 0081). Carro and Bays are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the propagation of annotations to other data items of Bays with the annotated anchor representing a second target of Carro. The motivation for doing so would have been to associate similar items by propagating the annotations to these related items. (See Bays, Page 2, paragraph 0017). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bays with Carro for the benefit of associating by annotation related items to obtain the invention as specified in claims 28, 44 and 55.

As per claim 30, Carro and Bays disclose the limitations of claim 28 as described above. Carro also discloses that the second anchor is within a second document. (See Carro, Page 6, paragraph 0082).

13. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) in view of Bays (U.S. Publication 2003/0018632 A1) as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of Stern (U.S. Patent 6,572,661 B1).

As per claim 29, Carro and Bays disclose the limitations of claim 28 as described above. Carro and Bays do not disclose expressly that the second anchor is within the document. Stern discloses that an anchor can be a link to another anchor in

the same file. (See Stern, Column 7, lines 37-41). Carro, Bays and Stern are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the internal link of Stern with the system and method of Carro and Bays. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the reader to easily reference data included in the current document. (See Stern, Column 1, lines 43-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Stern with Carro and Bays for the benefit of improved data readability to obtain the invention as specified in claim 29.

14. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) in view of Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1) as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of Stern (U.S. Patent 6,572,661 B1).

As per claim 32, Carro and Ingram disclose the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Carro and Ingram do not disclose expressly that the second anchor is within the document. Stern discloses that an anchor can be a link to another anchor in the same file. (See Stern, Column 7, lines 37-41). Carro, Ingram, and Stern are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the internal link of Stern with the system and method of Carro and Ingram. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the reader to easily reference data included in the current

document. (See Stern, Column 1, lines 43-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Stern with Carro and Ingram for the benefit of improved data readability to obtain the invention as specified in claim 32.

15. Claims 34-35, 46-47 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) as applied to claims 39 and 51 above, and further in view of Ingram and Bays

As per claims 34, 46, and 56, Carro discloses the limitations of claims 5, 39 and 51 as described above. Carro does not disclose expressly propagating the annotation to the node. Ingram discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target, and that the code includes identifying, in a hypertext structure, a node representing the target. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040). Bays discloses that annotations may be written to other data items. (See Bays, Page 6, paragraph 0081). Carro, Ingram, and Bays are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the propagation of annotations to other data items of Bays and the annotated anchor representing a second target of Ingram with the system and method of Carro. The motivation for doing so would have been to associate similar items by propagating the annotations to these related items. (See Bays, Page 2, paragraph 0017). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bays and Ingram with Carro for the benefit of associating by annotation related items to obtain the invention as specified in claims 34, 46 and 56.

As per claim 35 and 47, Carro, Ingram, and Bays disclose the limitations of claims 34 and 46 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the code includes identifying, in the hypertext structure, a connecting object representing the link, such as a graphic element, and altering the connecting object, such as reducing it's size. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Carro, Ingram, and Bays are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the identification, in the hypertext structure, of a connecting object representing the link, and alteration of the connecting object, such as a reduction in size, of Ingram with the system and method of Carro. The motivation for doing so would have been to take full advantage of the viewable area on the display (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Carro, Ingram and Bays for the benefit of taking full advantage of the viewable area on the display to obtain the invention as specified in claims 35 and 47.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- DeRose discloses XML linking.
- Fielding discloses web-based development of complex information products.

- Van Hoff (U.S. Patent 5,822,539) discloses a system for adding requested document cross references to a document by annotation proxy.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

18. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
8/1/2005